

I want to say, Madam Speaker, in closing that a virtual unwritten rule of this House should be that no distinction not proscribed by laws ever be made among American citizens, particularly in the people's House. We will all be challenged, I hope shortly, on an entirely unrelated bill, not the bill that the gentleman from Delaware spoke of that is due to come to the floor on delegate voting, but yet another bill, a bill 200 years in the making, 200 painful years of service in the Armed Forces, of paying taxes without representation which are going to call Congress to account, especially my party, which has flooded this floor with statements of belief in the full voting rights of the people of the Nation's Capital.

To his great credit, Representative TOM DAVIS when he chaired the Government Reform Committee discovered a magic opportunity, that is the only word for it because it won't come again soon, that the State of Utah had barely missed getting a vote in the last census. And he came to me and suggested that we put Utah and the District of Columbia together just as Alaska and Hawaii came in the Union together, and precisely the only way we have increased representation in the House and the Senate, and that is through political balance.

It was an offer we couldn't refuse, but it took us 4 years of my negotiating with the Democrats who kept telling me what they wanted and Mr. DAVIS negotiating with Republicans who kept telling them what they wanted, and finally we got the bill through the Government Reform Committee 15-14. This is such an extraordinary bipartisan vote on a controversial bill, 15 Democrats, 14 Republicans voting for the bill, the Davis-Norton bill for a House vote. Not a vote in both Houses, my friends, a vote in the people's House, went to the Judiciary Committee, additional requirements made, they were fulfilled by the State of Utah.

Here, we have the most Republican State in the Union and a big city normally Democratic who come forward together, who are literally joined at the hip together, and say regrettably, although we thank the other side who took this almost to the floor, through two committees, didn't get it to the floor, my party has an obligation written in miles of rhetoric, written in their platform over many decades to bring the bill for the full vote for the residents of the District of Columbia to this floor.

I congratulate my colleagues on the other side who almost brought us home. Now, the challenge is to those who got up and pointed their finger at the other side about not doing enough, the finger is now pointed at us and the time has come. While this bill has nothing to do with that, if you represent the District of Columbia, if you were second per capita in Federal income taxes, if you had gone to Arling-

ton during this war, if you had sat in churches during this war, then you would understand that any opportunity to remind this Congress, including my side, that the moment of truth has come and it has got to come in the 110th Congress for a seat for the District of Columbia this year. Meanwhile, we begin with an entirely non-controversial "yes" symbolic bill. Let this bill pass the House.

I thank the Speaker, and I particularly thank my good colleagues for persevering with us. I hope we have set the tone for the 110th Congress.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 392.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STREAMLINING OF SAFETY ACT AND ANTI-TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY PROCUREMENT PROCESSES

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 599) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to streamline the SAFETY Act and anti-terrorism technology procurement processes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 599

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STREAMLINING OF SAFETY ACT AND ANTI-TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY PROCUREMENT PROCESSES.

(a) PERSONNEL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that, in addition to any personnel engaged in technical evaluations that may be appropriate, a sufficient number of full-time equivalent personnel, who are properly trained and qualified to apply legal, economic, and risk analyses, are involved in the review and prioritization of anti-terrorism technologies for the purpose of determining whether such technologies may be designated by the Secretary as qualified anti-terrorism technologies under section 862(b) of the SAFETY Act (6 U.S.C. 441(b)) or certified by the Secretary under section 863(d) of such Act (6 U.S.C. 442(d)).

(b) COORDINATION WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) establish a formal coordination process that includes the official of the Department of Homeland Security with primary responsibility for the implementation of the SAFETY Act, the Chief Procurement Officer of the Department, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, the Under Secretary for Policy, and the Department of Homeland Security General Counsel to ensure the maximum application of the litigation and risk management provisions of the SAFETY Act to anti-terrorism technologies procured by the Department; and

(2) promote awareness and utilization of the litigation and risk management provisions of the SAFETY Act in the procurement of anti-terrorism technologies.

(c) ISSUANCE OF DEPARTMENTAL DIRECTIVE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, in accordance with the final rule implementing the SAFETY Act, issue a Departmental management directive providing for coordination between Department procurement officials and any other Department official responsible for implementing the SAFETY Act in advance of any Department procurement of an anti-terrorism technology, as required under subsection (b).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and to insert extraneous materials relating to the bill under consideration into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, Madam Speaker, I rise in support of legislation I introduced, the SAFETY Reform Act of 2007, which will help ensure that safe and effective antiterrorism technologies are being deployed by the Department of Homeland Security to bolster our security throughout the country.

□ 1330

The Support for Anti-Terrorism by Fostering Effective Technologies Act of 2002, or SAFETY Act as it is known, was designed to provide incentives for development and deployment of antiterrorism technologies.

The SAFETY Act was intended to address the liability concerns of businesses and to pave the way for innovative development of key antiterrorism technologies. Unfortunately, a lack of personnel within the Office of SAFETY Act Implementation, an excessively burdensome application process, and a lack of communication between the Department's procurement and management divisions made for difficult implementation of the SAFETY Act.

This legislation which I have introduced, along with Chairman THOMPSON, Subcommittee Ranking Member Rogers and many other members of the Homeland Security Committee, should fix many of those shortcomings.

Last year the Homeland Security Committee held a subcommittee hearing highlighting some of the problems that arose from the SAFETY Act's implementation. We heard from a variety of industry leaders and experts that the application process was overly burdensome, and that it took far too long for the Department of Homeland Security to properly evaluate and approve many of the applications that businesses submitted.

While I am pleased to see that many companies with new and innovative technologies have already applied for the SAFETY Act program, the program can be effective only when the applications are properly approved.

My legislation, therefore, takes three important steps to improve the effectiveness of the application process. First, this bill will help facilitate communication between the Department of Homeland Security's procurement sector and the Department's Office of SAFETY Act Implementation, which is the entity tasked with reviewing the applications. This approach will allow officials at DHS to thoroughly review applications while also maintaining quick turnaround times.

Second, the bill would require that the Secretary employ a sufficient number of analysts in the Office of SAFETY Act Implementation who can deal with the ever-growing number of applications. Appropriate staffing will help ensure that the applications are being processed in a timely manner, thereby allowing us to deploy the newest and best technologies as quickly as possible.

Finally, this legislation will help raise awareness of SAFETY Act risk management provisions among procurement officers across Federal, State, and local levels, and throughout the private sector.

Contributions made by private enterprises are an extremely important component of our Nation's security, and our governmental policies should continue to encourage innovation, not stifle it.

By passing the SAFETY Reform Act, I am optimistic that we will be able to effectively streamline the application process and encourage participation in this program across all levels of government and the private sector.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the SAFETY Reform Act of 2007.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), my friend and colleague.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank Chairman LANGEVIN and Ranking Member ROGERS for their leadership on this issue, and I am proud to have been a coauthor of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 599, a bipartisan bill to help protect and encourage companies that develop antiterrorism technologies. This bill helps implement the Support Anti-Terrorism by Fostering Effective Technologies, or SAFETY Act. The SAFETY Act was passed as part of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, and basically it encourages companies to develop antiterrorism technology by limiting their liability in the event of a terrorist attack.

As part of the oversight provided in the 109th Congress, the Homeland Security Committee determined that the SAFETY Act better protected the American people, and over 60 new technologies have been approved for coverage under the SAFETY Act in areas such as radiation detection, facility protection and passenger screening.

Unfortunately, in order to qualify for SAFETY Act protection, companies must go through a cumbersome application process rife with red tape. This bill cuts that red tape by requiring DHS to streamline their process and make it more effective.

In my district there are a number of companies developing antiterrorism technologies, including detection and identification systems. By limiting their potential legal liability, this bill will help them develop new technologies to address the real and constant threat of a terrorist attack.

This bill represents a commonsense, bipartisan approach, and I applaud my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, an approach to streamline government and make it friendlier to the American people. By doing this, we will make it easier for government and the private sector to work together to make America safer.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. LANGEVIN.

Today I rise to support a bill that reaffirms our commitment to ensuring that safe and effective antiterrorism technologies are being deployed by the Department of Homeland Security.

This bill, offered by my colleague Mr. LANGEVIN, will provide much-needed reforms to the SAFETY Act process within the Department.

In conducting oversight over the Department's implementation of the SAFETY Act over the last several years, it was apparent that there was several significant disconnections within the Department.

It became clear that the Office of SAFETY Act Implementation and the private sector were working on separate wavelengths. The right hand simply was not speaking to the left.

The private sector struggled to fulfill the lengthy paperwork requirements of the SAFETY Act, while the SAFETY Act office often seemed nonresponsive to private sector requests.

While the Department's adoption of final regulations this summer implementing the SAFETY Act appears to be an encouraging step forward, still more must be done to ensure that the government is being responsive to developments in the private sector.

This bill would require that the Secretary employ a sufficient number of

analysts in the Office of SAFETY Act Implementation who can deal with the ever-growing number of applications. This will ensure that applications are being processed in a timely fashion to bring more technologies to the table earlier than ever.

Perhaps more importantly, this bill will also ensure the proper coordination between the Department's procurement and implementing offices and raise the awareness of SAFETY Act risk management provisions among procurement officers across Federal, State and local government, and throughout the private sector.

In order to generate revolutionary breakthroughs in antiterrorism technologies, the Department must actively promote awareness of SAFETY Act protections not only among private sector, but across government procurement agencies. This legislation will help achieve those goals.

I congratulate Mr. LANGEVIN for offering this legislation and strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill. We must enable the private sector to deliver the revolutionary, breakthrough technologies that will help win the Nation's fight against terrorism.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK).

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, let me just say that this piece of legislation is an outstanding bipartisan piece of work. I know that it has bipartisan support, something that is going to help the private sector and be able to help us move forward in securing America.

I would like to thank my good friend Mr. ROGERS for his outstanding work and also on the Republican side. We have had a great discussion. As you know, in the last Congress I was the ranking member on the oversight committee, and all of us that are involved in this bill have heard hours and hours of testimony on why this is important. Even going as far back as the 108th Congress in the select committee, we were hearing from members of the private sector, saying that we want to participate in protecting America, need it be bio or what have you, but we also do not want to end up losing our shirts in the process or giving away secrets.

So I think this legislation is going to help us move forward. I hope it has a speedy process in the Senate. I look forward to coming to the floor later on to vote on this very good piece of legislation.

I just wanted to come by and say, once again, this is another example on how we have and we are now working in a bipartisan way on behalf of securing America for future generations and this generation so that we can continue to move forward hand in hand.

I want to thank the bill's sponsor from Rhode Island for bringing this

legislation to the floor quickly, and also Mr. THOMPSON, the chairman of the committee, and ranking member of the committee on the Republican side for bringing this to the floor for speedy consideration.

I rise today in strong support of this legislation. H.R. 599, the Support for Antiterrorism by Fostering Effective Technologies or "SAFETY" Act would provide greater incentive to US companies that develop and produce domestic, antiterrorism technologies and would better ensure the integrity of our national security.

Congress enacted the SAFETY Act in 2002 to limit the liability of manufacturers of qualified, antiterrorism technologies. This was seen as an essential step to promote innovation in technology, and to ensure that our first responders received the very latest and best equipment.

However, the methods used by the Department of Homeland Security to implement the original legislation were markedly slow and burdensome to applicants. This created disincentive to companies to participate in the program, and negated the original intent of the legislation.

I raised this issue and others during a September 2006 joint hearing before the Homeland Security Subcommittees on Management, Integration, and Oversight and Emergency Preparedness, Science and Technology. In that hearing, questions were raised addressing these issues; however, little was done in the closing days of the 109th to enact sufficient change. The Department did take positive steps to alleviate some of these issues, by issuing improved application "kits" and approving the final rule.

Still more is needed, and H.R. 599 would be a significant step in that direction. Because procuring these vital technologies as they become available is imperative to national security, SAFETY Act certification must happen at the same time as production.

To ensure that both our companies and our first responders are protected, this bill would require the Department to formalize the coordination between its procurement office and the Office of SAFETY Act Implementation. This would stand to greatly improve the efficiency of the program and the application process. Moreover, this bill would also ensure that sufficient staff be made available for reviewing applications. Delays in certification can dissuade companies from bringing life saving technology to market for long periods of time.

The SAFETY Act, as it is named, is about the security of the American people. Improving this process will ensure that our Federal, State, and local authorities have the tools they need to protect the American people.

I urge my colleagues, to support this bipartisan measure and to further strengthen our defense from terror.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The bill we consider today will streamline the procurement process of the Department of Homeland Security by implementing the SAFETY Act. The SAFETY Act was enacted in November 2002 as a part of the Homeland Security Act. At that time it was the intent of Congress to spur the development and deployment of innovative

antiterrorism technologies. The act does this, in part, by limiting the liability exposure of companies that provide those technologies in the event of a terrorist attack.

Since the law was enacted, however, the number of applications to DHS for SAFETY Act protections has fallen well below expectations. Critics charged that this result is due to a number of factors, including the Department's slow evaluation and approval process, the understaffing in key DHS offices, and the lack of full coordination between the SAFETY Act office and the procurement office in the process at DHS.

To address those concerns, the Committee on Homeland Security included bipartisan provisions in the DHS authorization bill for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, but time ran out, and neither bill came to law.

Last summer DHS issued its final rule to implement the SAFETY Act. The Department revised the application kit to make it easier for companies to apply for SAFETY Act protection.

To review those materials and hear from the private sector, I cochaired a hearing in the Management, Integration and Oversight Subcommittee with the former Chairman REICHERT and his subcommittee on September 13, 2006. We heard from the Under Secretary for Science and Technology and the chief procurement officer at DHS.

We also heard from leading industry representatives, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Homeland Security and Defense Business Council, and the Professional Services Council. The feedback we received from industry about the revisions DHS made to the process was mostly positive. Progress has been made.

DHS reports a 100 percent increase in applications, from 14 to 28, over 1 year since the fourth quarter of 2005, but more can be done to further streamline and improve the SAFETY Act procurement process.

The bill we consider today continues our work from the 109th Congress and makes those improvements. First, the bill would ensure DHS has a sufficient number of properly trained analysts to review and prioritize antiterrorism technologies that could qualify for SAFETY Act designation.

Second, the bill would establish a formal coordination process within DHS and involve the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, the Under Secretary for Policy, the chief procurement officer and the general counsel.

And third, the bill would require that SAFETY Act issues are fully considered in advance of procurement by DHS of an antiterrorism technology.

This bill would improve implementation of the SAFETY Act so the private sector can do more to protect our Nation from terrorist attacks. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to thank the speakers who have come forward. I want to thank Members on the other side of the aisle for working with us in a bipartisan fashion to bring this bill to the floor. I want to particularly recognize the leadership of Chairman THOMPSON and his due diligence in seeing that this act was put together in such a timely fashion and brought to the floor so quickly.

□ 1345

It is the responsibility of every level of government, whether it is the local, State or Federal level, first and foremost to protect our citizens. Our Nation is at war, and homeland security must be our top priority. The quicker that we can get these new and vital technologies in place that will better protect the American people, the better off we will all be.

So it is my intent that this act will clarify some of the problems with the original SAFETY Act and with the implementation that has been witnessed by the Department of Homeland Security, and I am pleased that we have brought this act to the floor today.

Madam Speaker, I move its passage.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I request that the following letters be made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES COUNCIL,
Arlington, VA, January 22, 2007.

Hon. JAMES LANGEVIN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats,
Cybersecurity, Science and Technology.

Hon. MIKE ROGERS,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Management, Investigations and Oversight.

HOMELAND SECURITY COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LANGEVIN AND CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: On behalf of the Professional Services Council (PSC), the leading national trade association representing the professional and technical services industry selling to the Federal Government, I am writing to endorse the legislation introduced by you and others (H.R. 599) to streamline the SAFETY Act and anti-terrorism technology procurement processes.

We appreciated the bipartisan leadership of Chairman Thompson and Ranking Member King during the 109th Congress to provide strong oversight of SAFETY Act implementation, including the execution of the responsibilities of the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Under Secretary for Science and Technology in administering the Act. We are confident that the Committee's support for the full implementation of the law and for extending the coverage of the Act to appropriate anti-terrorism technologies will remain strong through your Subcommittees' leadership.

PSC has been a strong and active supporter of the SAFETY Act since its development in Congress in 2002. We have commented extensively on the Act, on the implementing regulations, application kits, and operating principles. We have met repeatedly with key leaders within the Department and other offices in the Executive Branch. We testified before your Committee last year on the Act. We are pleased with the recent progress made in providing the regulatory and administrative framework for implementation, and with DHS's renewed commitment to moving

that implementation forward. However, more can and should be done.

While the Department is fully committed to robust implementation of the Act, we see your bill as an important step in helping the Department achieve that goal—whether through the allocation of additional full-time DHS employees to carry out the functions assigned under the Act or ensuring that the Department's internal procurement and policy organizations are aligned with and use the authorities provided under the Act. In addition, the Department plays an important role in providing guidance and information to other federal agencies and to other stakeholders about the Act. Each of these important items is addressed in H.R. 599.

We appreciated the opportunity to comment on the draft bill and are pleased to offer PSC's support for the legislation as introduced. We strongly support passage by the House early in the legislative cycle and look forward to further legislative and administrative action to fully implement the goals and objectives of the SAFETY Act. We also look forward to working with your Subcommittees and others on this important homeland security initiative.

In the interim, if you or your staffs have any questions or need any additional information, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

ALAN CHVOTKIN, ESQ.,
Senior Vice President and Counsel.

CROWELL MORING,

Washington, DC, January 22, 2007.

Re Proposed Legislation for Streamlining of SAFETY Act Processes

Representative JAMES R. LANGEVIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LANGEVIN: Your proposed legislation—"Streamlining of SAFETY Act and Anti-Terrorism Technology Procurement Processes"—represents a critical step forward to enhance the implementation of the SAFETY Act. This legislation recognizes the clear Congressional purpose embodied in the SAFETY Act—save lives through anti-terrorism technology.

One of the continuing impediments to more aggressive implementation of the SAFETY Act has been the concern that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has not fully synchronized SAFETY Act approvals with major procurements for anti-terrorism technology. Your legislation squarely addresses this concern by requiring the DHS Secretary to establish a formal coordination process to assure more effective implementation of the Congressional directive to accelerate the availability of anti-terrorism technology. Thank you for promoting the SAFETY Act's core purpose and clearing the path for moving anti-terrorism technology to the Nation's front lines.

Sincerely,

DAVID Z. BODENHEIMER,
Homeland Security Practice Chair,
Crowell & Moring LLP.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, January 23, 2007.

Hon. JAMES R. LANGEVIN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats,
Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LANGEVIN: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing more than three million businesses and organizations of every size, sector, and region, supports H.R. 599, the "SAFETY Act Reform Bill," which you

introduced with Rep. Michael D. Rogers (R-AL), Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Management, Investigations and Oversight. This bipartisan legislation provides an incentive to develop and deploy anti-terrorism technologies and services.

The Chamber applauds your leadership on this critical national security issue and looks forward to working with the Committee to ensure the SAFETY Act of 2002 is fully implemented.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

JANUARY 23, 2007.

Re Support for H.R. 599

Hon. JAMES R. LANGEVIN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats,
Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology,
House of Representatives, Committee on
Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LANGEVIN: I am writing to you in my personal capacity to express my support for the goals expressed in H.R. 599. H.R. 599 is intended to encourage the Department of Homeland Security to streamline the Support Anti-Terrorism By Fostering Effective Technology Act of 2002 (SAFETY Act) application and procurement processes. The bill is drafted to ensure that the Department utilizes a sufficient number of trained personnel to review any individual application, that the various components of the Department coordinate in implementing the Act, and that Department issues a management directive to coordinate procurement and SAFETY Act implementation efforts.

In light of my experience in drafting numerous SAFETY Act applications, I support the goals enumerated by the legislation, particularly as related to Department-wide coordination and coordination in procurement policy and implementation. Through my experiences with the SAFETY Act, I believe the Department has taken a number of solid steps in ensuring that such goals are met, and any encouragement from the U.S. Congress to meet those goals is welcome. The widespread utilization of the SAFETY Act is critical to defending our nation from terrorist attacks, and so I welcome the efforts of the U.S. Congress to support the Department's efforts at full implementation.

Thank you for your consideration, and I welcome any queries on this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN E. FINCH

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 599, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to streamline the SAFETY Act and anti-terrorism technology procurement processes.

I would like to thank my friend from Rhode Island, Mr. LANGEVIN, for introducing H.R. 599 which is essential to the exercise of our oversight responsibility over the Department of Homeland Security and critical in ensuring our great Nation's preparation for future terrorist threats and attacks.

This bill serves largely to rearrange and streamline the Support for Anti-terrorism by Fostering Effective Technologies (SAFETY) Act of 2002. The SAFETY Act was implemented to protect the American people from terrorism by providing incentives for the development and deployment of anti-terrorism technologies for homeland security by limiting the liability of providers of qualified anti-terrorism technologies from claims arising out of acts of terrorism.

Despite our legislative intent that the SAFETY Act would pave the way for innovative development of key anti-terrorism technologies by addressing businesses' liability concerns,

unfortunately industry was skeptical about the burdens imposed by the SAFETY Act's application process as implemented by the Department of Homeland Security. Regrettably, our high expectations for the SAFETY Act were not met and issues were raised about the excessively burdensome and slow evaluation and approval of applications by the Department's Office of SAFETY Act Implementation, OSAI, during the September 2006 joint hearing before the Homeland Security Subcommittees on Management, Integration, and Oversight and Emergency Preparedness, Science and Technology.

Significant improvements have been made to make this process more user-friendly, less time-consuming, and less costly for business with the SAFETY Act Application Kit, Kit, and final rule. However positive these improvements implemented may have been, additional improvements are of paramount importance to ensure that Congress' legislative intent of the SAFETY Act is met.

H.R. 599 will better address our legislative intent of the SAFETY Act and facilitate the following improvements: Make the application process more user-friendly, less time-consuming, and less costly for businesses; make the review process more swift, efficient and effective; result in a significant increase in the volume of SAFETY Act applications; more closely integrate the application and review process with the procurement of such technologies and services; and bolster awareness of and confidence in the efficacy of the SAFETY Act program among producers of anti-terrorism technologies as well as Federal, state, and local government purchases of these technologies.

While implementing the SAFETY Act, DHS has faced substantial criticisms about delays and insufficient personnel. It is critical that the Department continue to address these persistent issues and increase the number of highly trained, full-time personnel dedicated to reviewing and approving SAFETY Act applications. It is imperative that quick turnaround times are maintained when responding to operational needs. The link between the SAFETY Act office and the procurement office must be improved. If a product meets a test for procurement officials, there is no reason why the SAFETY Act office should have to run through a new process to test the effectiveness of the product.

I commend Congressman LANGEVIN for sponsoring this legislation that requires the issuance of a Department directive to formalize the coordination between the Department's procurement office and OSAI.

Thus, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 599, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to streamline the SAFETY Act and anti-terrorism technology procurement processes. It is my hope and expectation that the passage of H.R. 599 will ensure the proper and timely implementation of the SAFETY Act of 2002.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JONES of Ohio). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 599.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of

those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 599 will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules with respect to House Resolution 51, H.R. 476, and House Resolution 57.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 427, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—427

Abercrombie	Coble	Gohmert
Ackerman	Cohen	Gonzalez
Aderholt	Cole (OK)	Goode
Akin	Conaway	Goodlatte
Alexander	Conyers	Granger
Allen	Cooper	Graves
Altmire	Costa	Green, Al
Andrews	Costello	Green, Gene
Arcuri	Courtney	Grijalva
Baca	Cramer	Gutierrez
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Hall (NY)
Bachus	Crowley	Hall (TX)
Baird	Cubin	Hare
Baker	Cuellar	Harman
Baldwin	Culberson	Hastert
Barrett (SC)	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Barrow	Davis (AL)	Hastings (WA)
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (CA)	Hayes
Barton (TX)	Davis (IL)	Heller
Bean	Davis (KY)	Hensarling
Becerra	Davis, David	Herger
Berkley	Davis, Jo Ann	Herseth
Berman	Davis, Lincoln	Higgins
Berry	Davis, Tom	Hill
Biggert	Deal (GA)	Hinchey
Billbray	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Bilirakis	DeGette	Hirono
Bishop (GA)	DeLahunt	Hobson
Bishop (NY)	DeLauro	Hodes
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Hoekstra
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, L.	Holden
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart, M.	Holt
Blunt	Dicks	Honda
Boehner	Dingell	Hooley
Bonner	Doggett	Hoyer
Bono	Donnelly	Hulshof
Boozman	Doolittle	Hunter
Boren	Doyle	Inglis (SC)
Boswell	Drake	Inslee
Boucher	Dreier	Israel
Boustany	Duncan	Issa
Boyd (FL)	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Boyd (KS)	Ehlers	Jackson-Lee
Brady (PA)	Ellison	(TX)
Brady (TX)	Ellsworth	Jefferson
Braley (IA)	Emanuel	Jindal
Brown (SC)	Emerson	Johnson (GA)
Brown, Corrine	Engel	Johnson (IL)
Brown-Waite,	English (PA)	Johnson, E. B.
Ginny	Eshoo	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Etheridge	Jones (NC)
Burgess	Everett	Jones (OH)
Burton (IN)	Fallin	Jordan
Butterfield	Farr	Kagen
Calvert	Fattah	Kanjorski
Camp (MI)	Feeney	Kaptur
Campbell (CA)	Ferguson	Keller
Cannon	Filner	Kennedy
Cantor	Flake	Kildee
Capito	Forbes	Kilpatrick
Capps	Fortenberry	Kind
Capuano	Fossella	King (IA)
Cardoza	Fox	King (NY)
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Kingston
Carney	Franks (AZ)	Kirk
Carter	Frelinghuysen	Klein (FL)
Castle	Gallegly	Kline (MN)
Castor	Garrett (NJ)	Knollenberg
Chabot	Gerlach	Kucinich
Chandler	Giffords	Kuhl (NY)
Clarke	Gilchrest	LaHood
Clay	Gillibrand	Lamborn
Cleaver	Gillmor	Lampson
Clyburn	Gingrey	Langevin

Lantos	Neugebauer	Shea-Porter
Larsen (WA)	Nunes	Sherman
Larson (CT)	Oberstar	Shimkus
Latham	Obey	Shuler
LaTourette	Oliver	Shuster
Lee	Ortiz	Simpson
Levin	Pallone	Sires
Lewis (CA)	Pascrell	Skelton
Lewis (GA)	Pastor	Slaughter
Lewis (KY)	Paul	Smith (NE)
Linder	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Lipinski	Pearce	Smith (TX)
LoBiondo	Pelosi	Smith (WA)
Loebsack	Pence	Snyder
Lofgren, Zoe	Perlmutter	Solis
Lowe	Peterson (MN)	Souder
Lungren, Daniel	Peterson (PA)	Space
E.	Petri	Spratt
Lynch	Pitts	Stark
Mack	Platts	Stearns
Mahoney (FL)	Poe	Stupak
Maloney (NY)	Pomeroy	Sullivan
Marchant	Porter	Sutton
Markey	Price (GA)	Tancredo
Marshall	Price (NC)	Tanner
Matheson	Pryce (OH)	Tauscher
Matsui	Putnam	Taylor
McCarthy (CA)	Radanovich	Terry
McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
McCaul (TX)	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
McCollum (MN)	Ramsey	Thornberry
McCotter	Regula	Tiahrt
McCrery	Rehberg	Tiberi
McDermott	Reichert	Tierney
McGovern	Renzi	Towns
McHenry	Reyes	Turner
McHugh	Reynolds	Udall (CO)
McIntyre	Rodriguez	Udall (NM)
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Upton
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Van Hollen
McRogers	Rogers (MI)	Velázquez
McNerney	Rohrabacher	Viscosky
McNulty	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
Meehan	Roskam	Walden (OR)
Meek (FL)	Ross	Walsh (NY)
Meeks (NY)	Rothman	Walz (MN)
Melancon	Roybal-Allard	Wamp
Mica	Royce	Wasserman
Michaud	Ruppersberger	Schultz
Millender-	Rush	Waters
McDonald	Ryan (OH)	Watson
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Watt
Miller (MI)	Salazar	Waxman
Miller (NC)	Sali	Weiner
Miller, Gary	Sánchez, Linda	Welch (VT)
Miller, George	T.	Weldon (FL)
Mitchell	Sanchez, Loretta	Weller
Mollohan	Sarbanes	Westmoreland
Moore (KS)	Saxton	Wexler
Moore (WI)	Schakowsky	Whitfield
Moran (KS)	Schiff	Wicker
Moran (VA)	Schmidt	Wilson (NM)
Murphy (CT)	Schwartz	Wilson (OH)
Murphy, Patrick	Scott (GA)	Wilson (SC)
Murphy, Tim	Scott (VA)	Wolf
Murtha	Sensenbrenner	Woolsey
Musgrave	Serrano	Wu
Myrick	Sessions	Yarmuth
Nadler	Sestak	Young (AK)
Napolitano	Shadegg	Young (FL)
Neal (MA)	Shays	

NOT VOTING—8

Buyer	Lucas	Pickering
Carson	Manzullo	Wynn
Gordon	Norwood	

□ 1410

Mr. HELLER of Nevada, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. CALVERT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. CARSON. Madam Speaker, I was unable to record my vote for rollcall vote 47. Had I been able to record my vote, I would have voted “yea.”

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 51.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 51, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 428, nays 0, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—428

Abercrombie	Clarke	Garrett (NJ)
Ackerman	Clay	Gerlach
Aderholt	Cleaver	Giffords
Akin	Clyburn	Gilchrest
Alexander	Coble	Gillibrand
Allen	Cohen	Gillmor
Altmire	Cole (OK)	Gingrey
Andrews	Conaway	Gohmert
Arcuri	Conyers	Gonzalez
Baca	Cooper	Goode
Bachmann	Costa	Goodlatte
Bachus	Costello	Gordon
Baird	Courtney	Granger
Baker	Cramer	Graves
Baldwin	Crenshaw	Green, Al
Barrett (SC)	Crowley	Green, Gene
Barrow	Cubin	Grijalva
Bartlett (MD)	Cuellar	Gutierrez
Barton (TX)	Culberson	Hall (NY)
Bean	Cummings	Hall (TX)
Becerra	Davis (AL)	Hare
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Harman
Berman	Davis (IL)	Hastert
Berry	Davis (KY)	Hastings (FL)
Biggert	Davis, David	Hastings (WA)
Billbray	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayes
Bilirakis	Davis, Lincoln	Heller
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Tom	Hensarling
Bishop (NY)	Deal (GA)	Herger
Bishop (UT)	DeFazio	Herseth
Blackburn	DeGette	Higgins
Blumenauer	DeLahunt	Hill
Blunt	DeLauro	Hinchey
Boehner	Dent	Hinojosa
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hirono
Bono	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hobson
Boozman	Dicks	Hodes
Boren	Dingell	Hoekstra
Boswell	Doggett	Holden
Boucher	Donnelly	Holt
Boustany	Doolittle	Honda
Boyd (FL)	Doyle	Hooley
Boyd (KS)	Drake	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Hulshof
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Hunter
Braley (IA)	Edwards	Inglis (SC)
Brown (SC)	Ehlers	Inslee
Brown, Corrine	Ellison	Israel
Brown-Waite,	Ellsworth	Issa
Ginny	Emanuel	Jackson (IL)
Buchanan	Emerson	Jackson-Lee
Burgess	Engel	(TX)
Burton (IN)	English (PA)	Jefferson
Butterfield	Eshoo	Jindal
Calvert	Etheridge	Johnson (GA)
Camp (MI)	Everett	Johnson (IL)
Campbell (CA)	Fallin	Johnson, E. B.
Cannon	Farr	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Fattah	Jones (NC)
Capito	Feeney	Jones (OH)
Capps	Ferguson	Jordan
Capuano	Filner	Kagen
Cardoza	Flake	Kanjorski
Carnahan	Forbes	Keller
Carney	Fortenberry	Kennedy
Carson	Fossella	Kildee
Carter	Fox	Kilpatrick
Castle	Frank (MA)	Kind
Castor	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Chandler	Gallegly	Kingston